

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231*AS*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/421,043 10/20/99 MASUDA

T 503.34403VP2

020457 IM22/0606
ANTONELLI TERRY STOUT AND KRAUS
SUITE 1800
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
ARLINGTON VA 22209

EXAMINER

ALEJANDRO MULERO, L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1763 *18*

DATE MAILED:

06/06/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

	Application No. 09/421,043	Applicant(s) MASUDA ET AL.
	Examiner Luz L. Alejandro	Art Unit 1763

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 May 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 13-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 13-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 15) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 18) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 16) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 19) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 17) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 20) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Prosecution Application

The request filed on 5/21/01 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 09/421,043 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redeker et al. U.S. Patent 5,800,621 in view of Shang et al. U.S. Patent 6,055,927.

Redeker et al. shows the invention substantially as claimed including a plasma processing apparatus comprising: a vacuum vessel 12; gas supply means 300; an

electrostatic chuck 18; a lower electrode 28-to which a bias power source is connected (col. 3, lines 44-49); and a sidewall which is under temperature control through a heater 49 (see col. 4, lines 39-41).

Redeker et al. does not expressly disclose a jacket held inside of the side wall in an exchangeable state having a temperature controller for controlling the temperature by circulation of a heat exchange medium. Shang et al. show a plasma processing apparatus in which the walls 70 of the chamber 10 are heated by using a heated gas or liquid, such as water, from a recirculating fluid supply 61 (see figure 1 and col. 4-line 66 to col. 5-line 17). Also, note that Shang et al. clearly teaches that the walls of the process chamber may be heated in number of ways, such as by resistive heating, and that the method of heating is not critical (see col. 4, lines 61-65). In view of these disclosures, it would have been an obvious choice of design to one having skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus of Redeker et al. as to comprise a heating medium means for heating the chamber walls because such means is conventional in the art and because the method by which the walls are heated is not critical as taught by Shang et al..

With respect to the temperature controller, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the apparatus of Shang et al. comprises a temperature controller, in order to maintain the temperature of the heating medium at the specific temperature range disclosed at col. 5, lines 1-6. In the alternative, the examiner takes official notice that temperature control means are well known and used in the art to control the temperature of heat exchanging means.

Art Unit: 1763

With respect to the specific claimed temperatures, such limitation is directed to a method limitation instead of an apparatus limitation. Since an apparatus is being claimed as the instant invention, the method teachings are not considered to be the matter at hand, since a variety of methods can be done with the apparatus. The method limitations are viewed as intended uses which do not further limit, and therefore do not patentably distinguish the claimed invention. Moreover, note that Shang et al. disclose the claimed temperature range (see col. 5, lines 1-6).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Luz L. Alejandro whose telephone number is 703-305-4545. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30 to 6:00. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory L. Mills, can be reached on (703) 308-1633. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-305-3599.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.



LLAM

June 15, 2000



GREGORY MILLS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700